



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

la media docena de los cabritos", Menéndez, *Orígenes*, t. III, p. clxxxii, quoting *Comedia Seraphina*; "Que no verná hombre aquí que no saque dél cuando de la leña, otro el carbón, y otro el vino", Delicado, *Loz. And.*, Mam. XLI.

CHARLES PHILIP WAGNER.

University of Michigan.

La Part de Charles Nodier dans la formation des idées romantiques de Victor Hugo jusqu'à la préface de Cromwell, by EUNICE M. SCHENCK. Paris, Champion, 1914. 8vo., xi + 149 pp. (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, XVI.)

Of Hugo's gift for assimilating the ideas of others, Edouard Rod has said, not too delicately perhaps,¹ but with a degree of truth: "Comme une éponge dans un baquet, Victor Hugo a absorbé tout ce qui l'entourait. . . ." ² This judgment, tempered with a recognition of the poet's supreme achievements in the realm of the imagination,³ represents a view of his intellectual dependence which promises to become definitive. The problem has remained, however, to determine the exact nature of certain of the borrowings, and particular interest has attached to the *Préface de Cromwell*. Souriau, in his excellent critical edition, examined the influences which appear in this document, but failed to deal adequately with the contribution of Nodier. Miss Schenck's chief aim is evidently to fill this gap; while she does not limit herself to the one problem, and treats fully and conclusively of the influence of Nodier upon Hugo's early poetry and fiction, she puts the stress on the connection of their critical writings, and focuses attention on the *Préface*.

After assembling the specific remarks in the *Préface* which recall, and in a few cases absolutely match, declarations of Nodier, supple-

¹ Cf. Souriau, *la Préface de Cromwell*, Paris, 1897, p. 147, note 1.

² *Études sur le XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1888, p. 125.

³ As Rod himself tempers it, especially in his article on Hugo in *Nouvelles études sur le XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1899.

menting and correcting Souriau's investigation of these, Miss Schenck offers an imposing array of quotations from Nodier which, antedating the manifesto, foreshadow its basic ideas (Chapter III). Hugo's indebtedness is clearly demonstrated. Whether Nodier may have actively assisted in drawing up the document is discussed by the writer, and while she refrains, with admirable discretion, from insisting upon this possibility, she disposes effectively of Souriau's hypothesis of the collaboration of Sainte-Beuve.

The results reached in a consideration of "les trois essais de Nodier postérieurs à la Préface" (Chapter IV) are less acceptable. The reference is to three articles published in the *Revue de Paris*, in 1829-30, entitled: "Quelques observations pour servir à l'histoire de la nouvelle école littéraire"; "Des types en littérature"; "Du fantastique en littérature". Miss Schenck, maintaining that these are merely a recapitulation of the ideas of the *Préface*,⁴ furnishes abundant evidence of the somewhat strained relations between Nodier and Hugo, beginning at a period not long after the latter's proclamation was published, and draws the conclusion that Nodier, weary of being exploited, even slightly irritated, had determined to claim his own. The whole argument crumbles unless it can be proved that Hugo is repeated in the three *Essais*. Let us examine Miss Schenck's characterization of these.

They are accessible, she writes, and need not be described at length. Of the first we are asked to recall (p. 113) that "c'est surtout l'idée du dualisme des personnages de Shakespeare que relève l'auteur: mélanges, dit-il, du fantastique et du grotesque". This is a misstatement. While Nodier's article is somewhat discursive, as the title suggests, his initial sentence indicates clearly the main theme: "cet amour passionné qui est le principal élément des compositions de la nouvelle école".⁵ In the body of the article he stresses the significance of *Werther*, and adds approving comment

⁴ Cf. p. ix: "Pourquoi Nodier aura-t-il senti la nécessité d'affirmer ses idées—les idées de la *Préface*—après coup?" Cf. pp. viii, 113.

⁵ *Revue de Paris*, VII, 141.

on the new freedom of his contemporaries; the paragraph on Shakespeare consists of a tribute to his independence of classical tradition, with no emphasis upon the dualism (sic) to which Miss Schenck alludes.⁶ The following essay she describes thus (p. 113):

"Dans le second, il parle des types nouveaux de la littérature moderne par opposition au type abstrait de la beauté que connaît le classicisme, et pour lui les grands types modernes par excellence sont ceux de Dante, de Shakespeare, ceux qui ont tous un élément du grotesque, c'est-à-dire où le concret (qui mêle les éléments supérieurs et inférieurs) se substitue à l'abstrait".

As a matter of fact, the contrast upon which Nodier remarks is between two processes of artistic expression, one of which consisted in "la reproduction perpétuelle des beaux *types* antiques",⁷ while in the other "il s'agissait de saisir sur le fait le caractère et la physionomie des *types* modernes".⁷ That the difference between these is essentially a difference between abstract and concrete, Nodier does not say or imply, and, although he lauds Dante and Shakespeare, he neither singles them out in the way Miss Schenck's statement intimates, nor emphasizes their handling of the grotesque. In the third essay, Nodier, says Miss Schenck (p. 114), "esquisse le progrès du fantastique à travers les âges, comme Hugo l'a fait pour le grotesque". True. Then she adds: "Or ce 'fantastique' de Nodier est en somme le grotesque de Victor Hugo; quoique Nodier en souligne plutôt le côté pittoresque et féerique, tandis que Victor Hugo s'occupe davantage du difforme et du moral". The distinction should be sharper. The relation between Nodier's *fantastique* and Hugo's *grotesque* is occasionally close, as Miss Schenck has sufficiently proved in the preceding chapter, but it is not constant; sometimes the conceptions approach each other and sometimes they are wide apart, and the latter situation is exemplified in the present case. The precise attitude of Nodier

in this essay is revealed by three quotations. He refers to the *fantastique* as "cette muse de l'idéal, fille élégante et fastueuse de l'Asie";⁸ of its development in Germany he says: "L'Allemagne . . . porte dans ses croyances une ferveur d'imagination, une vivacité de sentimens, une mysticité de doctrines, un penchant universel à l'idéalisme, qui sont essentiellement propres à la poétique fantastique";⁹ and he concludes the article with the remark: "Il faudrait bien, après tout, que le fantastique nous revînt, quelques efforts qu'on fasse pour le proscrire. Ce qu'on déracine le plus difficilement chez un peuple, ce ne sont pas les fictions qui le conservent: ce sont les mensonges qui l'amuse".¹⁰ The *grotesque* of the *Préface*, which Hugo does not himself succinctly define, is discussed by Souriau, whose word carries authority, as follows: "En général, dans l'art, c'est le laid rapproché du beau, et placé là intentionnellement pour faire contraste, paraissant d'autant plus laid, et mettant en valeur le beau. En particulier, dans la littérature, le grotesque est d'abord tout cela, mais de plus c'est le laid comique, et c'est aussi le laid exaspéré: le grotesque est au laid ce que le sublime est au beau: c'est le laid ayant conscience de lui-même, content de sa laideur, le laid lyrique, s'épanouissant dans la fierté de l'horreur qu'il inspire, disant: riez de moi, tant je suis ridicule à côté du sublime; tremblez devant moi, tant je suis monstrueux".¹¹ Surely, Nodier's and Hugo's conceptions may not in this case be considered nearly identical.¹² In-

⁶ *Revue de Paris*, XX, 216.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 221-22.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 226. In an article by Breuillac on Hoffmann in France (*Revue d'histoire littéraire*, XIII, 427 ff.), which Miss Schenck scores roundly and deservedly in other details, is a definition of the *fantastique* of Nodier's essay, corresponding approximately to the impression given by the above quotations, to which she registers no objection.

¹¹ P. 136.

¹² That the kind of imagination Nodier describes may create grotesque figures, he points out in this article (pp. 208-209), but this establishes a relation, not identity. Breuillac (*op. cit.*, p. 456) states that the grotesque of Hugo is not far from that of Hoffmann, which he has likened to Nodier's, and cites Han d'Islande, Quasimodo and Triboulet, but finally admits a fundamental difference.

⁸ Nodier writes of certain of Shakespeare's characters (p. 145): "Ces esprits de sortilège et de malice, mélange inouï du fantastique et du grotesque". Is this dualism?

⁷ *Revue de Paris*, XVIII, 188.

deed, Miss Schenck's contention, in the light of her previous reference to a mingling of the fantastic and the grotesque as *dualism*, is somewhat extraordinary. And surely it may not be affirmed that this essay is hardly more than a recapitulation of the *Préface*.

In fine, these three articles deal with aspects of romanticism distinct from those treated in the *Préface*; each one has its individual right to existence quite apart from any relation to Hugo; and to assume that Nodier wrote them merely to claim the credit for the fundamental ideas of the celebrated manifesto is impossible. They do indeed contain many reminiscences of the earlier document. Nodier pleads for local color, for unfettered diction, demands freedom for French genius with burning eloquence, points out the influence of the social organization of a period upon its literature, insists upon the significance of Christianity in the history of literature, and states—a striking likeness—"les anciens ne paraissent pas avoir connu la mélancolie".¹² The majority of these ideas were current in 1829-30, and for Nodier to embody them in his articles does not in itself demonstrate a desire to stamp them as his own; in fact, such a method of establishing a claim, by tardy repetition, might seem ineffective. Yet, had Miss Schenck contented herself with suggesting the possibility of such a purpose, secondary to the chief object of the essays, she might have been credited with an interesting hypothesis. As it is, a tendency to overstate discredits the conclusion.

In fact, respect for the author's scholarship, and wonder at the occasional lapses, alternate. Her careful documentation is frequently impressive: she studies manuscripts edited and unedited, is familiar with the earliest and with the most recent Hugo literature, controls a quotation and points out a significant mistake, searches diligently in order to fix a date of publication. In an appendix she groups in chronological order the titles of more than three hundred articles published by Nodier in newspapers and reviews between 1813 and 1827, of which less than one hundred are reproduced in

Mélanges de littérature et de critique,¹⁴ thus listing for the use of investigators a large number of articles hitherto practically unknown. On the other hand, Hugo's prefaces and periodical articles prior to 1827, which constitute a respectable body of critical writing, are hardly given casual notice; indeed, to judge by Miss Schenck's remark (p. 44) that "Hugo . . . a été romantique en action avant de l'être dans sa critique, c'est-à-dire avant sa *Préface de Cromwell*", she is inclined completely to ignore them. Yet, to point an example, Nodier's idea that literature is an expression of society is clearly formulated by Hugo in the 1824 preface to *Odes et Ballades*, and such a comparison, in the interests of completeness, should be made. Moreover, the inaccuracies in the dissertation are manifold. Characterizing the *Préface*, the writer affirms (p. 1) that "Arioste, Cervantes, Dante, Rabelais, Milton, Ossian sont des noms qui reviennent sans cesse", when, as a matter of fact, although Milton and Dante are mentioned frequently, Rabelais is named only twice, Cervantes and Ariosto only once, and Ossian not at all.¹⁵ In a description of the *dénoûment* of *Jean Sbogar*, Miss Schenck says (p. 49): "En traversant les montagnes la voiture des deux femmes est attaquée par des brigands", whereas the truth is that the ladies are traveling, to Trieste, by boat, and it is only after the attack that Antonia, a captive, is landed and put into a carriage.¹⁶ Misprints are few,¹⁷ but failure to give complete references is frequent,¹⁸ and the misquotations are legion, which seems peculiarly unfortunate because so much of Miss Schenck's work consists of a judicial reproduction and alignment of Nodier's and Hugo's remarks. In many instances the inaccuracy is merely improper punctuation,¹⁹ but occasionally the misrepre-

¹⁴ Paris, 1820.

¹⁵ The names of Rabelais, Cervantes and Ariosto are repeated in the notes (p. 394, édition Hetzel), apropos of the mention of them in the text.

¹⁶ Cf. *Jean Sbogar*, édition Charpentier, p. 197 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. p. 12, für; p. 41, s'efforcât; p. 50, two notes labelled 1; p. 77, 1810 should be 1820.

¹⁸ Cf. pp. 63, 80, 93, 96, etc.

¹⁹ Cf. pp. 61-65, 76, 79-80, 89, 116, etc.

¹² *Revue de Paris*, VII, 145.

sentation, clearly unintentional, amounts to a gross error.²⁰

A good piece of work, disfigured by carelessness; this sums up the dissertation. Miss Schenck's method, if it may not seem a paradox to say so, is admirable; Chapter III, which is the best, is the product of a thorough, objective, scientific investigator. It may be charged that the plan whereby nearly the first half of the book is devoted to a consideration of Nodier's writings up to 1827 apart from Hugo, results in a dissipation of energy. That is, since the interest is wholly in the relations of the two men, and not in Nodier's individual accomplishment, a more compact presentation, with Chapter I fused with what follows and certain repetitions avoided, would have been better. And Miss Schenck's explanation (p. ix): "Evidemment il ne fallait aborder le problème de l'action d'un auteur sur un autre qu'après un consciencieux travail préliminaire", does not in itself establish the need of putting this preliminary study into the printed result. But very likely her plan is right. Amalgamation involves the personal element; a careful blending of the material might give the literary quality which is manifestly absent, but perhaps with a loss of scientific value. The author's tabular arrangement proves conclusively Nodier's influence on Hugo, and that was her purpose.

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DATE OF JONSON'S *Tale of a Tub*

The date of *Tale of a Tub* has been much discussed. Collier first placed it in Elizabeth's reign on account of allusions. Fleay, and the more recent supporters of this theory, think it was written and possibly acted in an earlier

form during Elizabeth's reign, and then revised and presented in 1633 for the purpose of satirizing Inigo Jones. The chief arguments for the revision are the presence of *The Scene Interloping* between scenes labelled *one* and *two* in Act IV; and the fact that the satire on Inigo Jones is chiefly found in two specific places in Act V; the first beginning, V, ii, 28,

Can any man make a Masque here i'this company;

and the second, V, ii, 22,

I must conferre with Mr. *In-and In*,
About some alterations in my Masque.

My investigations lead me to believe that the play was all written at one time, and that about the time of its presentation in 1633. My chief reasons are as follows:

(1) The presence of *The Scene Interloping*, taken by itself, cannot be held to prove more than that Jonson did not decide on the satire until after beginning Act V. (2) The so-called 'revised' portions form an integral part of the plot. Tub has perfected all his plans for marrying Awdrey, and is seeking some one to make a *Masque* to complete the wedding festivities when he asks the question noted above. All his plans go awry, and Awdrey is married to another. He then has, of necessity, to confer with In-and In about alterations, since he cannot, of course, have the thing carried out according to his earlier plan. (3) Internal evidence shows that the scene was laid in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. Miles Metaphor, who is represented as quite young, remembers "King Edward our late Leige" (d. 1553), and "has set down the pompe" with which he rode forth. Canon Hugh and Hiltz, represented as strong and lusty in their disguise, as Captain Plums and his companion both fought at St. Quentin's (1557). Other facts give the same idea. If the scene was laid in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, there is no more reason why the play should have been written in 1598-1604, than in 1633. If the play was all written at one time, it must have been written at about 1633 on account of the satire on Inigo Jones.

²⁰ Cf. p. 64, "jeune moisson" should read "jaune moisson"; p. 96, the misquotation from Souriau (p. 310); p. 115, "le monde du cartonier" should read "les moules du cartonier"; etc.